UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Making the Best of It

By ALSON H. ROBINSON

The Aftermath of the Naval Conference

(From Our English Correspondent)

By HARRISON BROWN

Ulsters in India

By SUDHINDRA BOSE

VOLUME CV NUMBER 13

Chicago, May 26, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY FELLOWSHIP

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JEREMIAH LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 12, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

SPECIAL!

A Series of Nineteen Brief Essays

entitled

"PARABLES OF WAR AND PEACE"

by

John Haynes Holmes

Editor-in-Chief of Unity

These Parables have been written by Mr. Holmes at odd times since the close of the Great War. They are meant to represent in symbolic or narrative form the basic truths of the absurdity and horror of war and of the blessing of peace. Each Parable deals imaginatively with one specific aspect of the subject.

This special series will be published in successive numbers of Unity beginning with the issue for April 7.

Subscribe Now $3.00 Per Year

Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 195
Making the Best of It—ALSON H. ROBINSON.. 197
Jottings—J. H. H..... 199

ARTICLES—

Parables of War and Peace—VIII. On the Styx—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES..... 199
The Aftermath of the Naval Conference—HARRISON BROWN 200
Ulsters in India—SUDHINDRA BOSE..... 203

POETRY—

Builders for Time—*Raymond Kresensky*.... 195
Two Poems on the Present Crisis—*Kenneth W. Porter:*
To Mahatma Gandhi 199
To Ramsay MacDonald 199

THE STUDY TABLE—

Spanish-American Poets—BERTHA SULLIVAN PAPAZIAN 205

CORRESPONDENCE—

Our Super-Assets and Naval Parity—LUCIA AMES MEAD 206
Social and Economic Work in India—SHANHI S. RAY 206

THE FIELD—

Gandhi Fund—Relief for the Sufferers of the Non-Resistant Struggle in India..... 207
The Tragic Dilemma in India—New York *World* 207
Institute of Politics—Tenth Session..... 207
An Appeal to All Christian Workers and Missionaries—JOSEPH CORNELIUS KUMARAPPA... 208
Walt Whitman Fellowship..... 208

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CV MONDAY, MAY 26, 1930 NUMBER 13

Builders for Time

He built his house and said, "I'm through,
I've laid the stones. The lines are true."
He closed the doors to other men
And like a beast crouched in his den.

But no house lasts the stormy weather
Like one that all men build together;
And no house seems as cold as stone
As one in which men live alone.

So men walked by—They were his brothers
Who built for time, building for others;
And he had not a friend about
Who built to shut his neighbor out.

RAYMOND KRESENSKY.

UNITY takes pleasure and pride in presenting herewith to its readers the latest addition to its fellowship of editors—Mr. Raymond H. Palmer, minister of the Unitarian Church of Lynn, Massachusetts. Mr. Palmer has been in his present parish since 1927, and by virtue of his intellectual integrity, forthright speech, keen spiritual insight, and fearless interest in all questions of ethical and social import has more than once stirred a conservative church and a conventional community to quick excitement. His name was carried to all parts of the country in March, 1929, on the occasion of the inauguration of President Hoover, when he said some things about the superstition of kissing the Bible in pledge of the official oath which shocked propriety and rejoiced all honest thought. More recently he became the center of a furious local storm when he spoke some wholesome truths about the materialism and vulgarity of our so-called "best people," and placed responsibility for many of the scandals of our time where such responsibility properly belongs. Mr. Palmer is a man of the prophetic type. The articles which have appeared in these columns from his pen, have disclosed his vigor of style, his cogency and courage of thought, and his uncompromising idealism. Mr. Palmer belongs in our Unity Fellowship, which is instantly challenged by his presence to be worthy of him. His editorials, book reviews and occasional articles will appear in due order, and we believe will in all cases not merely maintain but lift the standard of UNITY's true worth. We find great satisfaction in commending Mr. Palmer herewith to the favor and goodwill of our readers.

Once again the Supreme Court has come through just precisely 100 per cent in support of the Prohibition law. What chance do the "wets" think they have to repeal, or to modify, or even permanently to nullify this law, with the highest tribunal in the land thus unanimously sustaining the inalienable right of the citizens of the United States to destroy the liquor traffic if they elect so to do? By this last decision of the Supreme Court, there is placed in the hands of government a weapon of enormous potency. For the decision outlaws, and therefore makes subject to seizure and destruction, not only liquor itself, but also all the paraphernalia that has to do with liquor. Barrels, bottles, corks, flasks, cocktail shakers—all these are now contraband goods, and all traffic and even possession of such goods is now and henceforth illegal. It will be interesting to see what our high-class shops, catering to the swell trade, will do with all the silver-tipped whiskey articles that now adorn their show-windows. Almost as interesting as to see what the five and ten-cent stores will do with their cheap articles of the same description! These mercantile places will, of course, be as illegal as saloons or speak-easies if they carry these articles in stock, and thus immediately liable to raids and padlocking. Our prophecy is that the trade will stop forthwith, and a flask or cocktail shaker be as sure a sign of lawlessness as the liquor it contains. All of which is common-sense as well as good law! The day of the bootlegger and his customer is slowly but surely coming to an end. The net is growing tighter and ever tighter. Once again it is being proved that, in the long run, government enlisted in a righteous cause by the franchise of the majority of its citizens can overcome lawlessness, criminality and arrogant defiance.

The American mind has a nonchalant and irresponsible way of forgetting things, especially unpleasant things, but we think it will be a long time before it forgets the horror of three weeks ago in Sherman,

Texas. We had believed that the limit of fiendish cruelty had already been reached in this lynching business. Indeed we had imagined that lynching itself was beginning to disappear. But here comes a deed so ghastly, so barbaric, so inhuman, as to carry us back not merely to the horrid lynching bees of the '80s and '90s of the last century, but other centuries back into the most terrible darkness of the past. The picture of that raging mob, howling like famished wolves at the momentary frustration of its will, and then leaping in one ferocious outbreak of madness at the building containing the imprisoned Negro, and burning it flat to the ground as the only means of wreaking vengeance upon its helpless prey, this surpasses anything yet seen in our American history. Not even the tale of the redskins has such a chapter! It palsies the hand, it freezes the blood, just to think of such monsters as the members of this mob actually living upon the earth in human form. And they are all native-born Americans, we have no doubt! What to do about such a phenomenon baffles the intellect. Punishment of the guilty parties must follow, of course, if any such thing as society is to survive in Texas at all. But punishment in itself is no remedy. Such a horror as this Sherman outrage springs from roots as deep as American history itself, and from a soil as elemental as human nature. There is something rotten, cancerous, diabolic in us Americans, that deeds like this can be done. The home, the church, the school, the state, our American traditions, our native folk-ways—where is the blame? We must answer this question, be sure of that, else is our civilization doomed and damned forever.

We don't believe in calling names. On the other hand, we do believe in scientific diagnosis of ails and ills. Therefore, when we find the notorious "red"-baiter, Fred R. Marvin, declaring that the rejection of Judge Parker as a nominee to the Supreme Court bench was a Socialistic attempt to "destroy the Court," we see no reason why we should not say flatly that such an utterance seems to us to indicate an unbalanced mind. Look for a moment at the Senate roll-call on this issue of Judge Parker! The vote was taken on Wednesday, May 7th, and resulted in the defeat of President Hoover's nominee by 41 to 39. Among the 41 senators who were involved in what Mr. Marvin calls "a plot" to do away with the Supreme Court, we discover such men as Glenn and Deneen, of Illinois, both of whom voted to confirm Chief Justice Hughes—Copeland and Wagner, of New York, who also voted for Mr. Hughes—Robinson, of Indiana, never before suspected of "red" proclivities—Walsh, of Massachusetts, a good protectionist Democrat and a steadfast Roman Catholic—and men like Couzens, Caraway, Ashurst, McKellar, Trammell, whom it is difficult to identify with Moscow and the Bolsheviks. Of the 23 Democrats who voted against Judge Parker, many, of whom Heflin may be taken as an example, were from the South, where "reds" are scarcer than Yankees. And it is this group, says Mr. Marvin, which is seeking to "destroy the Supreme Court," and eventually, of course, the Constitution and the nation! To us such talk is sheer insanity. It places Mr. Marvin for what he is—a man of unstable mind, dense ignorance, stupid prejudice, and a fear of liberal and progressive thought which has become a mania. We marvel that such a man can find supporters. Yet we remember the famous remark of Miss Royden—quoted before in these columns—that there are no more fools in America than elsewhere, but that America is the only country where the fools are organized.

The winning of the Pulitzer Prize by Mr. Marc Connelly's sensational play, "The Green Pastures," raises once again the question as to the worth of expert opinion, of trained critical judgment, as over against the sound instinct of the common people. This drama, now hailed, after the public's seal of almost ecstatic enthusiasm has been placed upon it, as the greatest play in the history of our American stage, had a remarkable experience before production. It was offered by its author to managers and producers of the highest standing and most sincere purpose in New York. It seems incredible that this play could have been read by the Theatre Guild, Mr. Arthur Hopkins, Mr. Winthrop Ames, Mr. Jed Harris, not to mention others, and been turned down by them all. But such happens to be the case! Not until a Wall Street broker, a money plunger on the exchange, read the script and caught some suggestion of its beauty, did "The Green Pastures" find its way to the boards. And immediately the great and general public, utterly unsophisticated, but ready as always to be touched by profound emotion, leaped to it like a starving man to a meal! How can we trust our experts when such things as this can occur? The same question presses upon us in the case of books as well as of plays. Take our famous book clubs, for example—the Book-of-the-Month Club, the Literary Guild, and the rest! We are first of all amused that these clubs, carefully surveying all new publications to find the one volume of prime interest and importance, never by any remotest chance agree on the same book. The "book of the month" is always a different book in each separate case. But more important is the fact that these books are selected and trumpeted abroad month after month

by the trained critics sitting in the judgment-seats, while the oblivious public goes right ahead choosing its own books and finding for itself the masterpieces that are to endure. There is something curiously pathetic about these book club selections. Not the papal imprimature but the popular heart finds in the end what is good.

Before our editorial on May 12th, last, could be printed, the King of England had appointed as his new Poet Laureate, in succession to the late Dr. Bridges, the famous John Masefield. The rise to such an exalted position of courtly favor of a man who in his youth was variously a sailor, a bar-tender and a vagabond, is of course a dramatic episode, and it is not surprising that this aspect of the royal appointment has attracted the largest degree of newspaper attention. But more important than any such biographical romantics is the solid worth of John Masefield's poetic achievements, and his eminent qualifications, therefore, for his distinguished post. The publication of "The Everlasting Mercy" was a memorable event, for a parallel to which one must return to Scott's publication of his "Lay of the Last Minstrel," or Byron's publication of the first two cantos of his "Childe Harold." The sensation created by this narrative poem was confirmed by "The Widow in the Bye Street," "The Daffodil Fields," and especially "Dauber," an incomparable masterpiece of the sea. Since then Masefield has apparently grown weary, but he has written some immortal sonnets, a brilliant *tour de force* in his "Reynard the Fox," and in his "Tristan and Isolt," a not unworthy successor to the familiar works of Tennyson, Swinburne, and Thomas Hardy. What Masefield needs is stimulus, a new acclaim, and may this be prompted by the honor of the laureateship! Incidentally—a matter not of importance but of interest—it is to be noted that Masefield is a Prohibitionist, and thus scorns the "butt of sack" which is traditionally the perquisite of the King's poet. He has been a teetotaler for twenty-five years, he says, and then adds the significant words, "One is stimulated by one's own feelings." Exactly! The man who cannot live, or achieve, or be happy without drinking alcohol, is a man who is subnormal in those elements of inner psychological or spiritual endowment which mark the difference between a defective and a genius.

Making the Best of It

Every one who is interested in the study of contrasts will find a wealth of material in the London Naval Conference. Perhaps one of the most striking of these contrasts appears when one sets the high-sounding assurances with which the conference began over against the Treaty itself. It is quite certain that the masses of the people in all the nations involved were deeply concerned for the success of the enterprise as the early assurances of the delegates were transmitted by invisible messengers through immeasurable space. The romance of trans-Atlantic communication scarcely matched the eagerness of the listeners for success. Now at least the unadorned results appear in the official text of the treaty.

The hopes of common men have been surplanted by a formidable document of five long parts with a mass of articles, annexes and sections. If one is interested in metric tonnage, gun calibre, standard displacement and all that sort of thing, he will find this instrument of absorbing interest; but to him whose hopes are centered in the abolition of war-like devices and the achievement of peaceful relationships this document may rightly be regarded as what is known in the vernacular as a flop.

Can the success of such a conference and such a Treaty, in the face of this disappointment, be regarded as serving any useful purpose? Of all the great milestones by which it is proposed to mark the progress of mankind onward and upward, this is of the earth earthy. How to realize any of those hopes with which this enterprise began in the face of this disappointing document is the next task with which the mind of the western world is confronted.

It is not the purpose of this statement to violate the well-established anathema of the philosophy of Pollyanna. It does, however, seem justifiable to employ this disappointment which was born at London to point once again to some of the obvious and well-worn paths along which the race has had to move to higher levels. How to get something out of nothing obviously presupposes the possession of ancient alchemy. It is the old question which one of the characters in the New Testament proposed upon a certain occasion: "How can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" Our proposal is, therefore, that the best to be done at the present stage of the journey is to accept as ungrudgingly as possible what we have and find a means of making something good come from it.

Taking all such commonplace situations and instruments as have appeared in the past and tracing their slow evolution to more stationary forms, it appears that there are certain elements which might be referred to as Factors of Emergence, whereby there appears something like a transformation of satisfaction

out of disappointment, of good out of evil. Here, for example, are these mechanical devices which appear to constitute the wonder of the age. Man began his efforts to measure the flight of time with crude and simple devices. First appeared the sun dial, useful perhaps upon sunny days, but unhappily not all our days are cloudless. Then followed the water clock which functioned with a certain measure of satisfaction in the summer time but which froze up in winter. It seems a far cry from these primitive devices to the modern electric clock which the house wife plugs into her electric socket and then forgets, and yet it was because man bungled with his trial and error process through these various stages of the sun dial, the water clock and the hour glass that he is able to measure with such astonishing accuracy the present flight of time, whatever the flight of time may be.

Luther Burbank did the same thing when he removed the formidable thorns and impenetrable armour from the cactus plant, making this despised form of vegetable life a new source of nourishment for the enrichment of the life of man and beast.

So ordered, confined and cared for is our existence, these days, that we are prone to forget that there was a time when there were no clocks, no money, no pen and ink and paper, no trains, no bathrooms, no radios. Sometimes we think that must have been a blissful day in which to live. It may even be that the complete achievement of everything which we hope for in connection with the London Conference might bring new and perplexing situations. In any event this insistence of mother wit which man possesses has enabled him to take the commonest factors and situations and use them to the enrichment of his life.

Religion at its best has also attempted a similar task. It has realized that its treasure is contained in earthen vessels and that its goal can only be achieved by a process of gradual improvement, pinning its faith at every step upon the inherent value of the material which is placed in its keeping. Religion has on the whole been rather speculative in this matter, approaching it through an attempt to solve the ever-present mystery of existence of evil in the world. Roughly speaking, religion has to offer three suggestions in the solution:

First there is the classic story of Job in the Old Testament. Job suffered terribly through no fault of his own so far as he could determine, and the only way he was able to figure it out was that since God was responsible for everything else it must be that God had done this also and that there was nothing else to be done about it than accept it.

The second solution of the dilemma which religion offers is of comparatively recent development. It declares that good is only relative in the universe, while evil is merely an illusion. All of which is comforting to people who care for that means of escape but which unfortunately falls victim to the logic of Mr. Walter Lippmann, who insists that if we are going to deny the existence of evil we must also deny the existence of good.

There is a third approach, by no means new in human thought, and experience, but which appears to be enjoying a renewal of popularity under the banner of Humanism just now, which insists upon the reality of both of these forces: that in our experience evil and good are both present and all mixed up but that man possesses within him the ability to transform this evil into good. Just how this transformation is going to be achieved is still open to question.

Whatever the avenue of emergence may be, it looks as though the third factor, which we speak of as education, must eventually take command of the situation. Through the science of biology we are learning a lot about ourselves in these modern times which was denied to former generations. We know within certain limits what our native inheritance is. We are assured that there are certain determining factors which cannot be changed. We came into this world through virtue of our possession of that strange force, the germ plasm, which constitutes the vital part of physical life. Within the germ plasm, scientists tell us, are those strange little things called chromozones which give uniqueness to the individual. Saint Paul was no biologist. It was a branch of science with which happily he did not have to struggle, but in spite of his ignorance he made several very wise observations. In writing to one of the churches in which he was interested he said to them that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God. If one asks what flesh and blood can inherit the one certain answer which biology makes is "flesh and blood." If that were the end of this deterministic matter the picture would be very dark. The conviction which has gradually though slowly been gaining ground again is that education is capable of taking this matter and of assisting us in developing good habits and of avoiding bad ones.

It is obviously a very far cry from the crude document now engaging the Senate of the United States to the one simple thing that civilized people everywhere know that they want and eventually will be determined to have. It is merely here suggested that the story of mankind appears to bear ample testimony that through these avenues: mother wit, religious convictions and education as a creative force, man has been able to mould himself and his environment more nearly to his heart's desire.

Alson H. Robinson.

Jottings

In the Calendar of a certain orthodox church we read of missionaries in Japan, India, Africa, China, California, and North Dakota. We have known ever since the Mooney case that California was a heathen land, but we never knew before that North Dakota was in that category.

In a recent *Literary Digest* report, East St. Louis was set down as the "wettest" city in the liquor poll, and Pasadena as the "driest." To anybody who has ever seen, as we have, East St. Louis and Pasadena, this result is all one wants or needs to know about Prohibition!

Challenged to specify how he would improve the universe if he had the power, Robert G. Ingersoll said that he would make health and not disease contagious. We add to this a suggestion of our own! If we could do so, we would make sex potency coincident with mental potency. Unlimited sex capacity coupled with no brains seems to us to be one of the most terrifying phenomena life affords.

If one can imagine a man swimming successfully across the Atlantic Ocean from New York to Liverpool, one can imagine a "dry" argument or fact passing successfully through the "wet" newspaper press of this country. Our imagination breaks down as completely in the one instance as in the other.

The census-takers, in order to check up on the matter of unemployment, had to ask the question, Were you at work yesterday? Why would it not be a good thing to check up on the matter of religion by making the census-takers ask the question, Were you in church last Sunday? If this were done, we should know for the first time what church-attendance in this country really amounts to.

The pedestrian is a sympathetic and kindly animal. Yet he has been known to snort at the tale of an autoist run down by a train at a railroad crossing.

J. H. H.

Parables of War and Peace

VIII

On the Styx*

"I weary," cried Charon. "My back is broken, my arms palsied. And still they come, in swarms, in myriad swarms, children bleak with hunger, women, bloody men."

Never in all his aeons of labor had the old boatman seen such days as these. Full he packed his boat with shivering souls and rowed as he had not rowed before. Back and forth from brink to brink he sped, till it seemed as though the portals of Hades must swing shut from very crowding. But still waxed the multitudes on the earthward shore, still filled the boat with its unwonted freight; children sick with terror, women, and always bloody men.

"I take no more," cried Charon, "my boat sinks, my oar fails!"

"Patience, old man, patience." It was the voice of Dis. "You toil now as you have not toiled in all the centuries gone. But soon you shall rest forever. A few more years of war, nation against nation, world against world, and all will have come at last to your dark shores. Then may your oar drop, and your boat lay down its rotting timbers in the sedge. For life, and death, will be no more."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

*See "Charon," in Dunsany's "Fifty-One Tales."

TWO POEMS ON THE PRESENT CRISIS

I.

To Mahatma Gandhi

["Gandhi Saving His Face, but Power is Gone, Says Missionary."—*Press Cutting.*]

"Yes, he is losing out," the gossip ran,
"His followers have felt the wings of doom,
And those who gorged the streets to greet the man
Can now be lodged in one small attic room."

II.

To Ramsay MacDonald

[On hearing that he would sanction Gandhi's arrest.]

We know how you have striven to erect
A citadel whose ramparts should protect
The workers, women, children, crippled, old,
Against the predatory hosts of gold.
And by your toil, sometimes almost alone,
You now at last have laid its cornerstone,
When senile prophets of a bygone day,
Snarling with yellowed fangs, have dared to say:
"Unless you batter down the temple-wall
Of this our subject, your own shrine shall fall!"
But never has a lasting state been built
Whose walls were reared in wrong and sealed with guilt.
Therefore be warned: no mortar with the taint
Of blood from veins of hero and of saint
Can bind the walls of your new commonwealth
With the strong certainty of moral health,
Nor can you prop the loose and crumbling stones
Of your new temple with the martyrs' bones.
The chain with which you'd keep your state from harm
Must have one cuff attached to your own arm.
So hold your hand, lest you must strive in vain
To cleanse from it an ancient, deathless stain.

KENNETH W. PORTER

The Aftermath of the Naval Conference

(From Our English Correspondent)

The famous cartoonist Low, of the London *Evening Standard,* summed up the London Conference by showing two whiskered old men in tail coats standing one on each side of a barbed wire fence labelled "National 'barrier'," over each waves the "Grand old flag of Whats-its-name" which is upheld by a box of dynamite. Low's comment is: "The fatuous politicians (droning the same old pre-war stuff). While we regret the disappointing results of the naval conference, we are hopeful of the future; but we insist that no agreement on disarmament can be reached which is not based upon the preservation of national rights." In the foreground career past the trucks of international industry; in the background races the express "International Banking" and overhead fly the planes of international finance. The International Bank was opened at Basle on the day the Naval Treaty was signed!

It has been a conference of evaded issues and of hopes which were dashed to the accompaniment of the old familiar tunes of pre-war arguments. Generally speaking official circles call it a success whilst the peace movement is inclined to dub it a failure, and both are right. Economically, technically and even politically its achievements are by no means negligible, in terms of peace its value will probably depend chiefly on the ability of the world to profit by its lessons. Economically it has prevented the waste of some hundreds of millions of dollars. Technically it has resulted in an extension of the holiday in capital ship construction, and this must be made to mean the disappearance of mammoth ships and the consequent drastic reduction of the host of smaller craft needed to protect them. Italy has refused to sign the suggested compromise on the method of limitation (limitation by categories with provision for transfer from one category to another), and this is therefore not included in the Treaty, but it is difficult to believe that the discussions at London will not go far to solve this technical obstacle when it re-appears at Geneva. Politically the conference has consolidated the still too small amount of agreement and mutual confidence so laboriously built up between the three Powers which have signed all five parts of the Treaty, and it has definitely checked competitive building between the United States, Britain and Japan. This is invaluable since it robs the big navy boosters on both sides of the Atlantic of their most mischievous argument whenever a trace of political friction arises. The fact that the treaty merely establishes officially what Mr. Hoover and Mr. MacDonald had already agreed upon should not diminish recognition of its importance. And in addition it has provided a whole series of warnings to those who have peace at heart. It should at least be recognized now that the time for disarmament propaganda is before and not during a conference and also that there must be far closer contact in the future between those working for peace in the different countries, there is still all too little between Europe and America but it is disgraceful that there should have been none at all between the French and British peace movement. The naval staffs do not make this mistake and yet it is we who profess to be friends and they who look upon each other as potential enemies! It is obvious that it is not enough to provide statesmen with "evidence of support" for the "drastic reductions" they claim to desire; they must be made to feel that the demand for disarmament is such that they dare not resist it. We have long been accustomed to the spectacle of the Socialist Paul-Boncour acting as the mouthpiece of the French Etat Major at Geneva; we have now had the edifying experience of watching a Socialist First Lord acting as the mouthpiece of the British Admirals.

In their joint memorandum of October 9th the President and the Prime Minister said: "In a new and reinforced sense, the two Governments not only declare that war between them is unthinkable, but that distrusts and suspicions arising from doubts and fears, which may have been justified before the peace pact, must now cease to influence national policy. We approach old historical problems from a new angle and in a new atmosphere." A few weeks later the spokesman of the United States at London was suggesting that his country should build a bigger and better "Rodney," and the Prime Minister was waxing eloquent about "the navy being us" and about the necessity for Britain to retain the Two Power Standard. The conclusion is obvious; the Admirals are still in control. It is fair to assume that Mr. Stimson is not personally afraid that Britain will use the "superiority" of the Rodney and the Nelson to attack the United States, nor can one seriously suppose that Mr. MacDonald expects France and Italy, the only other European powers with navies of importance, to sink their differences for the sake of joining in a blockade of Britain. But if they did not wish to be maneuvered into acceptance of the "experts" jargon of trade routes and armed security why did they so carefully avoid using the battering ram of public opinion which democracy provides? Not every diplomatic conversation should be made public, of course, but if the "new atmosphere" is not to be blown away then every difficulty which halts a conference should be openly explained. One of the great benefits of conferences is the instruction they provide both for statesmen and public as to the problems and attitudes of other nations; we are told, and I can well believe it, that the late conference was particularly instructive for the statesmen concerned, the more cause for citizens of countries which claim to be democratic to resent the fact that they were left so much in the dark. Publicity today is inevitable; if it is not made an adjunct to statecraft it will surely be provided by leaks and rumors and become a hindrance or a danger.

When the Peace Pact was signed on August 27, 1928, nobody supposed that within two years it would lead to the abolition of navies, but since we had it on such good authority that the pre-Pact doubts and fears "must now cease to influence national policy" surely we were not exacting in expecting the battleships would be reduced to 10:10:6. We cannot blame France and Italy for the fact that the proportion is to stand at

15:15:9 and involve the somewhat early scrapping of only nine vessels. When these battleships were built the 3000-ton submarine was non-existent, and this is only one development which shows that, so far, increase in fighting strength has kept well ahead of all efforts at "disarmament." Any haggling about "parity," any insistence upon a contingency clause implies that our countries' faith in the Peace Pact has not yet reached beyond the atmospheric stage, for either we have faith in our neighbors' peace pledges or we continue to doubt them and to rely upon the advice of "experts" governed solely by strategical considerations, i. e. by the expectation of war. The moral failure of London is due to the fact that three months were spent in discussing the relationship of the Powers in terms of war, on which basis there is every inducement not to disarm. The fatuous attempt to palm off as an "advance" the elaboration of rules for the polite use of submarines in the war we have all renounced is a key to the moral bankruptcy of the proceedings. Every bit as bad were the hypocritical mouthings of Mr. Alexander about the "wickedness" of submarine warfare, which provoked the fitting retort from France that Britain had been known to use mines quite freely and mines could not save drowning sailors! When will Anglo-Saxon politicians learn that these attitudes of sanctimonious self-righteousness only serve to confirm the impression abroad that they are incorrigibly hypocritical? Those of us who are concerned for the prestige of our country may well deplore the fact that our spokesmen so often make it appear ridiculous.

But when all has been said as to the weakness of Anglo-Saxon leadership the fact remains that France and Italy prevented the signature of a Five Power Treaty and that the delegations of both those nations received ovations from large sections of their people and press because they had successfully evaded disarmament. "The geese cackling a welcome to the pate-de-fois-gras man!" France and Italy came to no agreement on figures because there is no political agreement between them. Recriminations are worse than useless apart from the fact that both the French and the Italians are becoming quite unpopular enough as it is, and in both countries an ignorant majority of the people still seems blind to the fact that this may prove their undoing, and that in our shrunken little planet the only real guarantee of security is the sympathy of world opinion. The Anglo-Saxon delegations failed to give the great moral lead which they had proclaimed and we therefore have no ground for preaching, but it may be as well to examine briefly the reasons for the attitudes of the French and Italian Governments. To begin with neither Government even professes to believe in the possibility of permanent peace. France desires it, but on her own terms; Italy also desires it, at least for a certain period. France realizes that war at any time could only be disastrous to her but she remains under the control of the Old Men of the War whose minds can work only in terms of bluff and intrigue; Italy, and possibly Mussolini himself, is the victim of the Fascist religion of prestige expressed in terms of force. France got much booty from the war and sees in her retention of the hegemony of Europe her only chance of keeping possession of it. France is now the most powerfully armed and wealthiest nation on the Continent; industrial development has proceeded at a great pace during the last decade; her gold deposits abroad are such that sudden withdrawal would shock the credit market of the world; not only is there no unemployment in France but she is obliged to import foreign labor to till her exceptionally fertile soil. Based on the old fashion of thinking, there are here found all the elements which go to make chauvinism easy to foster, especially when added to a prevalence of insular mentality amounting almost to narcissism. Seeing only the facts of history and blind to its real lessons France's old men of the war have taught the French people that the Security of their "superior civilization" depends upon their ability to resist the imminent attack of jealous neighbors. In other words, France dislikes conferences, disarmament or otherwise, because as she sees things she has everything to lose and nothing to gain by them.

The policy of France is the stabilization of the status quo in Europe on the basis of the Treaty of Versailles, much of which was dictated by her spokesmen, Clemenceau and Tardieu. Inside this barricade she will be as pacific as you please; her Foreign Minister has for years been the star turn at Geneva; she is all for arbitration on the basis of existing treaties, which is by no means the same as being anxious to extend the process to cover all disputes as a safeguard to peace. She would gladly lead the movement towards the "United States of Europe" provided it remains a limited company of which France is the managing director. She will even consent to reduction of armaments on condition that her fellow signatories recognize that the status quo must be eternal and will pledge themselves to fight for its maintenance if necessary. She is somewhat embarrassed by her system of military alliances at times but since they are part of the sacred fabric they have to be made the best of. The "aggressor" business, all the exploitation of that myth, has its roots in this policy of the status quo; no "formula" of aggression would prove acceptable which did not conform to it, for it is not the "Angel of Peace" whom it is sought to defend but the hag of Versailles.

There is therefore deadlock, not because France harbors aggressive designs but because when her Government demands security as a preliminary to disarmament it does not mean security from wanton attack; in that sense France and her satellites have more guarantors than any group of nations in history; what they desire is perpetuation of the victors' peace. Now few, if any, responsible people advocate immediate tampering with the frontiers of Europe, but on the other hand no impartial student of history, however superficial, can help seeing that even the best of treaties must have elasticity for adjustment to the changed needs of time and circumstances. If the Outlawry of War is to prevail it is essential that Article 19 of the League Covenant shall be kept alive. French policy may be in accord with what some intended the League of Nations to be but it is diametrically opposed to what the League is destined to become and it leads into paths dangerous alike for France and for Europe. Despite the hypocrisy of other Great Powers they are not bound by sympathy for Allies to defend the inexcusable flouting of the Minorities Convention as M. Briand has on occasion defended Yugo-Slavia, and they are not led back by tenderness for the status quo into fostering the antipathies and feuds of Eastern Europe. In terms of world peace there is probably not much to choose between the Government of M.

Tardieu and that of Mussolini and we address our appeals to the wrong quarter in those countries in expecting disarmament from either. Happily in France at least the voice of an opposition is becoming heard even above the clamor of a tied press; in politics few happenings are fatal and no regimes are eternal.

And what of Italy? She joined the noble throng of Allies late in the day, and broke a military treaty to do so. The Italian Foreign Minister in 1914 was for keeping the pledge to the Central Powers but public opinion seemed against it. Italy paid for this belated decision to join the armies of Right and Justice by receiving but a meagre share of the swag. Fascism came and with it the railed-in frontier and the taxation of bachelors; Italy's problem being largely how to dispose of her surplus population the obvious solution was to increase that surplus and birth control became a national as well as a Roman Catholic crime. Mussolini rattled the sabre as the Kaiser had done before him and with much the same effect of making his political judgment the slave of the popular emotion he had himself created. The French Etat Major professed great fear and cleverly exploited the antipathy of the French Socialists to Italian Fascism. On several occasions Mussolini's bluffing came near to striking sparks and eventually aroused a concern which the French people were at first slow to feel. There were also small political questions outstanding which long drawn-out diplomatic conversations failed to solve, questions unimportant in themselves but embittered by exaggeration on the part of the Italians and unwillingness on the part of the French to admit Italian "rights" to what the French considered to be favors. One such demand is based on the secret treaty of 1915 promising Italy "compensation" for any acquisition of German colonies by France and Britain by an extension of the Tripolitan frontier in the sandy waste of the Libyan desert! Another is the demand of Italy that her nationals in Tunis, a French colony in which Italians predominate, shall retain Italian citizenship until the third generation.

It was not a promising atmosphere in which to expect two nations to agree to reduce their navies, and, in view of Britain's interest in the Mediterranean, it is surprising that Mr. MacDonald did not attempt to mediate between France and Italy before the Conference assembled. What matters now is whether the situation has been improved or otherwise by the Conference, and for the moment it is almost impossible to say. On the whole I am optimistic; opinion in both countries is excited but in both would be susceptible to calming influences. France is in no hurry to resume diplomatic conversations but also she will not do anything to foment trouble. Mussolini will doubtless find the temptation to make some pre-war gesture irresistible, for Italy's claim to naval parity with France has all along been due to worship of the god prestige. But Italy is not financially independent and not only cannot afford, but on the most "expert" advice, does not need such a navy as France for defensive purposes. If France shows no eagerness to respond in kind to the childish challenge of Fascism there is no reason why time should not enable political differences to be settled and each Government to climb down unobtrusively from the uncomfortably pointed stool of exaggerated amour propre.

There is another question which bids fair to become acute as a result of the conference. The wobbling of the United States about the consultative pact idea led to far more dangerous wavering on the part of Britain as to her attitude to her present commitments. In the belief that the United States would agree to consult in the event of a crisis, Britain began long discussions with the French about the interpretation of Article 16. When a formula had at last been found the French considered that it did not provide enough "security" to enable them to reduce their tonnage figures. Finally both the offer of a consultative pact and the interpretative formula were withdrawn though we have certainly not heard the last of either. The immediate result, however, is uncertainty and general confusion. Public opinion in England had been stirred, by the Liberal press in particular, against the danger of giving more guarantees to France, and much play was made with the fact that previous commitments had done nothing to increase the French sense of security. Some commentators bluntly stated that England would do better to withdraw her existing guarantees although they did not specify how this difficult feat should be accomplished. Such declarations did great disservice to peace for they increased the real or assumed anxiety of France lest Britain's improved relationship with America should mean a slackening of her interest in the League of Nations, and they also roused the purists amongst the League supporters to lend aid and comfort to the French official view by reviving the discussions on the theory of sanctions. The absurd statement has been made more than once that Britain faces the alternative of joining in "Anglo-American dictatorship" or helping France to develop a League sanctions system. It is time a halt was called to such pernicious propaganda, the only possible beneficiaries of which can be the war-mongers and die hards in all countries.

Anglo-American dictatorship may be dismissed at once as a crazy notion worthy only of the Hearst press, unless indeed is meant by that term the stand for a beginning of disarmament on the basis of existing security which it was hoped the Anglo-Saxons would make at London. The further organization of sanctions is politically almost equally impossible, for in spite of all the confused references there is now more than a glimmering of understanding that "sanctions" are designed less as a guarantee of peace than of the status quo in Europe.

The existing situation is not so difficult for those who care to see. Britain is pledged under the League Covenant to sever relations with any member of the League which resorts to war. The designation of the guilty party and the taking of action against it requires a unanimous vote of the Council. Today a "resort to war" would mean also a breach of the Peace Pact and inevitably the United States would be concerned and would desire in her own interests to see peace restored. That would imply consultation with the other law abiding nations as to what measures should be taken. Any "war or threat of war" must inevitably be a matter of concern to a nation which has billions of dollars invested throughout the world, the alternative to admission of the fact in advance is the certainty of being involved in any outbreak, the occurrence of which would be rendered far more probable by the refusal of the investing nation to take part in preventive measures. Consultation IS implied in the Peace Pact, all

the more reason therefore why it should be definitely so stated by separate agreement, for such a statement would constitute an overwhelming obstacle to the preparation of wanton attack, and in the case of a resort to war the origins of which were confused it would insure an independent examination of the facts. Apart from the false principle of trying to erect institutions of peace on commitments which imply bad faith, one danger of the attempts to organize sanctions has always been that force might be invoked not to restore peace but to operate automatically against some attempted breach of the Versailles Treaty such as the union of Austria with Germany would be. It is for this reason presumably that the United States will sign no blank cheque "to enter other peoples' wars" and many European nations feel the same way. An actual resort to war must henceforth be a matter of concern at least to every industrialized nation; that is why it is so necessary to concentrate on prevention of any such escapade. It is safe to predict that most of the parish pump isolationists both in America and Europe would be the first to howl, not perhaps for the restoration of peace, but for the punition of the nation which had interfered with their trade. It is not an accident that the Daily Mail and the Chicago Tribune are the allies of the interests vested in war.

France therefore need have no fear that Anglo-American friendship means coldness towards Geneva; the League is essential to Europe and Britain is bound to the Continent both geographically and commercially. The role of Britain should be to complete the weaning of the League from its original purpose as an instrument for the enforcement of the Treaty of Versailles, and to open further the eyes of America to the fact that in the modern world the prevention of war is a collective business which requires constant political contact and consultation with other nations. "Peace is not a static thing." Those who would trade with all the world must also know how to talk politics with all the world, for in these days it is politics which follow trade rather than trade which follows the flag.

HARRISON BROWN.

Bockenheimer Landstrasse 47
Frankfurt Am Main. Germany.

Ulsters in India

The Indian National Congress has declared for complete independence for the whole of India. In order to understand the full significance of this declaration, one should bear in mind that politically speaking there are at present two Indias: one is the India of the British Provinces, which may be called British India; the other is the India of "protected" States which may be referred to as Indian India. The former is under a British ruler called Viceroy, while the latter is under the control of Indian Princes with the title of Raja, Maharaja, or Nawab. The rulers of Indian India claim special treaty rights with the King of England; and, as a rule, they are opposed to Indian independence. They are ultra loyalists.

The territories of the Indian Princes vary in size and importance from States as large as Texas to tiny plots of land as small as an American township. There are nearly 600 Indian States. They cover more than one-third of the area of the whole of India and comprise a population of 78 millions—nearly one-fourth of the total.

The Princes are called "allies" and not "subjects" of Great Britain. They are also addressed by the British government as "Your Highness." When the most important of them comes to British India on state occasions, they receive salutes of guns as mark of their rank and dignity. They are not, however, free sovereigns; neither have they any standing in International Law. Should their rights be infringed upon by the British government, they can not lay their grievances before the League of Nations or any other international tribunal. They have no juridical international life.

The Princes enjoy a certain measure of local authority in the internal administration of their States; but the supremacy of the British Crown in all their affairs, internal or external, is absolute. They can neither declare war or peace; nor can they negotiate treaties with other States or nations. Most of them pay tribute to England and are required to maintain imperial service troops, which are often a heavy burden upon the smaller States. Yet for all their pains and all their services, they must accept the "advice" of a British Resident in their dominion, whose word is virtually the law. Some say that it is the Residents who are the actual rulers, and the Princes are only figure-heads. Formerly many of them did have sovereign rights; but at present none of them have real power, real independence, and real sovereignty, even though they are loaded with high-sounding regal titles. In actual practice they are, as a Maharaja admitted to me, subservient tools of the British government.

A few of the Indian Princes are not altogether unaware of the absurdity of the situation in which they find themselves. At the time King George held a Durbar at Delhi some years back, the rulers of the Indian States were summoned to appear before him. To the Durbar came the Gaekwar of Baroda, one of the most progressive and distinguished rulers of all India. Instead of bowing lowly three times in a crab-like backward movement from the throne, as he was expected to do, the Gaekwar gave a curt nod to King George, turned his back to the throne, and walked off. This was considered lese majesty. There was a great uproar in England. The British press rang with indignation and demanded his political head. The Gaekwar finally saved himself by profuse humble apologies for his "perfunctory" conduct.

In spite of incredible difficulty, a number of States like Mysore, Baroda, Tranvancore and Cochin have made progress in education, government, and public welfare. But the great majority of them are backward. They are lagging behind even the alien bureaucratic government of British India. The ruling Princes, like the Stuarts, are believers in personal rule and the divine right of kings. The interests of the States are regarded as identical with their personal interests. They have no disposition to recognize the people's rights. There is no freedom of speech or of the press;

nor is there much security of person and property. A good many of these States still employ forced labor, which is a polite name for state slavery.

Progress in India is made harder because of the backwardness of the Indian States. They are, after all, an essential part of the Indian nation. The people in the Indian States are in no way different from the people in British India. The same history unites them; the same tradition binds them; the same social and economic conditions on either side of the imaginary border line cements them. But if the people of the Indian States are left in condition of backwardness, ignorance and abject subjection, they will inevitably prove a drag on the rest of the country. The Princes are, however, maneuvering to keep their subjects separate from British India and keep them in unrestrained absolutism. In this way they are believed to have the support of the British government. It is interesting to note that contrary to the wishes of the Princes, the people of the States are in sympathy with the liberating program of the Indian National Congress and have dared to take an active part in the framing of its policies. The leaders of Indian States are as insistent in their demand for constitutional reforms in British India as in Indian India. They want the Princes to abandon their autocracy. And above all, they are opposed to separating themselves permanently from their fellow-countrymen in British India. They regard a policy of cessation and separation as a dire calamity.

The main contention of the Princes is that they have treaty obligations with the British Crown which can not be transferred to a self-governing India. It is to be observed that the Indian States originally entered into treaties not with the Crown, but with the East India Company when it was extending its sway over India. The Crown got the Indian empire from the Company along with the treaties with the States. Now it is obvious that the Crown under the British constitution does not mean the King alone, but the King in Parliament. Moreover, ever since the transfer of India to the Crown in the middle of the last century, the Indian States have had their dealings with the government of British India, and not directly with the Crown. The Indian nationalists hold that if the East India Company could transfer its treaty obligations with the States, there is no reason why the Crown could not transfer the same obligations to a reconstructed Indian government.

A committee was appointed last year to inquire into the relations between the Princes and the government of India. This committee, known as the Butler Committee from its chairman, Sir Harcourt Butler, has recommended that in the future the Viceroy—not the Governor-General in Council—should be the sole agent for the British Crown in all dealings with the Indian States. As such the Viceroy alone, without any popular check from India, will have the absolute control of the destinies of the States. This is a recommendation which the Princes do not approve, as it may lead to arbitrary interferences on the part of the Viceroy. What they wish is the right of "direct relationship with the Crown."

Moreover, the Butler Committee, in its attempt to isolate the Indian States from British India, has said that "in view of the historical nature of the relationship between the Paramount Power and the Princes, the latter should not be transferred without their own agreement to a relationship with a new government in British India responsible to the Indian government." This is exactly what the Princes themselves asked. Through their English counsel they had stated to the Butler Committee that "the British government as Paramount Power has undertaken the defense of all the States and therefore to remain in India with whatever military and naval forces may be requisite to enable it to discharge that obligation. It cannot hand over these forces to any other government—to a foreign power such as France or Japan; to a dominion government such as Canada or Australia, nor even to British India."

This is a blow to the hopes of a united India. If the proposals of the Committee are carried out, it will mean the permanent partition of India into two distinct and separate entities. It will not only tighten the hold of England on the Princes still further, but it will create 600 Ulsters in India. In the guise of safeguarding the rights of the Princes, Britain will continue to dominate the States even if British India attains dominion government or complete independence.

The people of the States, on the other hand, asked the Butler Committee to end the personal rule of the Princes and introduce democratic reforms. The Committee has not only ignored their pleas, but has commended the existing system and thus suggested the perpetuation of arbitrary rule of their masters. The report of this Committee, says the *The Hindu* (Madras), "is unqualified slavery dressed up though it is in the glittering robes of royalty."

The leaders of the nationalist movement, both in British India as well as in Indian India, regard the report of the Butler Committee as an ominous attempt to drive a wedge between the people of the British territories and their brothers in the States. It will undoubtedly have the effect of creating areas suitable for "imperial economic development," or exploitation, long after Britain has relinquished its control over the rest of the peninsula. India will be like a house divided against itself. More, England will remain in 600 Indian Ulsters "with whatever military and naval forces may be requisite" to enforce its overlordship.

The Indian patriots have visioned their country as one and indivisible. The government of the India of tomorrow must be of the Federal type. The Federated India, or the United States of India, should include the Provinces and the autonomous States owing allegiance to a strong representative national government. The Princes need not be liquidated. They may continue to function in their respective States as constitutional sovereigns; but they must be a part of the Federated India. The British India and Indian India, say the leaders of Indian political thought, must be welded together in a Federal union.

It is apparent that British India will win freedom soon or late. Nothing, it seems, can stop its progress toward liberty indefinitely. But what will England do with the Indian States? Will they be created into Eastern Ulsters, and thus render the efforts for a free and united India impossible? Will Britain have a harvest of bitterness and hatred, or a harvest of justice and fair play and good will?

SUDHINDRA BOSE.

The Study Table

"Spanish-American Poets"

Miss Alice Stone Blackwell's volume* containing "translations of 207 poems, by 89 poets, representing 19 Latin-American countries," comes as a particularly welcome and graceful offering at this time when political nonfeasance and malfeasance have done so much to estrange and antagonize the peoples of the two Americas. It establishes for her a secure place in the small but distinguished circle of American and English poets, historians, and essayists who have found in the various manifestations of the Spanish soul and scene, on both sides of the Atlantic, that material for philosophical and artistic reaction which leads to the creation of yet other worlds for us in the ever-expanding universe of our sympathies and thought.

It was of Richard Crashaw who, though born only a few years after the death of the great St. Theresa of Avila, had even before his conversion to Catholicity written his unsurpassable "Hymn" and "The Faming Heart" in her praise—it was of him that Alexander Pope at the age of 22 remarked: "He writ like a gentleman" and "not to establish a reputation," and that therefore "nothing regular or just could be expected of him."

By this sort of count, we should, I fear, be obliged to erase from the list of foreign appreciators and interpreters, "so dear to Spanish pride," almost our entire group, since there is to be found here scarcely a name of out-and-out distinction that does not, with respect to the matter in hand, carry with it some sense of divine caprice and over-plus along with distinguished attainment—whether it be the miracle of Crashaw; Borrow's casual classic, "The Bible in Spain"; the infrequent or solitary translations of poems—often in imperishably beautiful form—by Lockhart, Southey, Fitzgerald, Longfellow, Bryant, Ticknor, John Hay, Thomas Walsh, Arthur Symons; the histories of Prescott; the essay by Havelock Ellis; or even; I venture to say, the works of William Hudson.

Now, how very strictly Miss Blackwell belongs to the category of those who "write like gentlemen" must be evident to all who are in the least familiar with her literary career. Though noted chiefly as a humanitarian and reformer she is also basically a poet but she has devoted her poetic gift almost solely to the task of making known to the English-speaking world something of the poetic literatures of foreign races whose contributions to this art have, for one reason or another, been largely or totally unknown to the world at large—a proceeding which, together with the chivalry and large charity which have characterized the rest of her public life, allies her in a very definite sense with the knights as well as with the saints of old Castile. Actually, I believe, there is no woman living in America at the present time who combines more attractively and less ostentatiously those striking qualities of head and heart which have always been exemplified in those women upon whom history has agreed to confer both the epithets "blessed" and "great." Her life-long work for Woman Suffrage, as speaker, pamphleteer, and editor of "The Woman's Journal"; her unremitting efforts for the freedom of Armenia; her rendering into English verse of a volume each of Armenian, Yiddish, and Hungarian poetry; her "Reminiscences and Letters of Catherine Breshkovsky"; the forthcoming biography of her mother, Lucy Stone; and now this book (not an anthology) of translations from Spanish-American poetry, the largest collection as yet made by any single author —all this bears ample testimony to the scope of Miss Blackwell's intellect and sympathies and to the disinterestedness of her motives.

A foreword arouses lively expectations. It informs us that poetry in the Spanish-American countries occupies the place in popular enthusiasm that baseball commands with us; that when the famous Mexican poet, Amado Nervo, died in Montevideo, Argentine and Uruguay each sent a battleship to convoy his body back to Mexico, and Cuba sent out a cruiser to join the escort into Vera Cruz; and that in Colombia, when a favorite author has written a new poem, the whole community turns out to hear it read.

Just what, however, does one expect to find upon turning to the poems themselves? Referring back to one's impressions of this accentuated race as it appears in the history of old Spain, one looks for the figures of the saint and the inquisitor, the knight and the tyrant, the explorer and the conqueror, the lover and the ascetic, the bon vivant and the recluse; for ideality wedded to realism, humility to pride, generosity to utter recklessness—everywhere intense light accompanied by impenetrable gloom. Aware of the exciting scenery of the whole vast and untamed South American continent one expects also to be awed by the sight of gigantic mountains, by the rush of savage and mighty rivers, by the lure of those mimic oceans, the far-stretching pampas, and the almost phantasmagorical shapes of many an alien bird, beast, flower, and tree. Recalling the political strivings and revolutionary outbursts of Latin-America, one awaits with certainty pledges to and praises of Freedom uttered rapturously and with the undying faith of the glorious Byronic nineteenth century bard:

. . . "Yet, Freedom! yet thy banner torn by flying . . .
Streams like the thunder storm against the wind." . . .

And, happily, in many of these expectations one is not disappointed. Poems in honor of the Cid, Cervantes, and Don Quixote greet us with the warmth of old friends endowed with additional life and wearing a slightly different dress. We do not meet the inquisitor or the implacable monarch but we do frequently encounter the valorous old explorer as well as the modern and by us but dimly apprehended revolutionist and liberator. The saint, too, reappears in that preoccupation with the soul in its quest for individual perfection which finds expression in a considerable number of the poems; and the considerable number concerned with social revolt bears witness to the ardor and extent of our modern faith in the perfectibility of the world.

As the poems included are all of Miss Blackwell's own choosing, the tone of the book is naturally high. One might cite innumerable examples of the kind of poem written to be "lived by." It is the sort of book a noble youth would enjoy!—the heroic note is so often sounded. The religious poems, often a bit melancholy,

*"Some Spanish-American Poets," by Alice Stone Blackwell. Published by D. Appleton & Co. $3.00.

perhaps, now and then too self-conscious in their aspiration or self-admonition, sometimes rise to the almost inaccessible heights of the mystical. In the poetry of Gabriele Mistral of Chile, this, at times, takes the form of a delicate and passionate humanism, always dedicated, often exquisitely exalted as in the lyrical round entitled "The Children Dance." One of the greatest poems in the collection is, I think, Prado's "Lazarus" which, inspired with the noblest and freest conceptions of that two-fold aspect of the universe which we call life and death, expresses the subtle profoundities of its philosophy in terms of amazing beauty.

For the love poems, I must confess, I care least. In general, they seem to me to be but the more or less conventionalized flowers of a border set in the shadow of the church, or in a box behind some lattice, or in a formal vase not too far from the eye of some vigilant if kindly duenna. But as they actually represent a long-established convention, they have, no doubt, their own validity and they are, at least, serene. Besides there are exceptions. "The Mass at Dawn," a long love poem in the form of an elaborately wrought metaphor, is in conception, rhythm, and verbal grace a thorough delight; as is also "Ephemera," a shorter poem, playful, tender, pictorial, and extremely melodious. These two, together with "Stories of the Cid," "The Children Dance," "The Last of the Aztecs," "The Sower of Stars," Chocane's characteristic sonnets on "The Andes," "The Straits of Magellan," The Condor's Dream," "The Orchids," "The Volcanos" and certain other poems such as "The Ombu," "The Paraguayan Woman," "The Day of the Dead," and "Santos Vega" would furnish such thrilling material for the pencil of some great illustrator, Arthur Rackham, for instance—as to lead one almost to beg for an illustrated edition. All of which reminds me of the handsome format of the present volume which contains, on the opposite page, the Spanish text of every poem given.

I have spoken of our debt to Miss Blackwell for this generous and fascinating glimpse into the hearts and lives of the peoples on the other side of the Panama which, incidentally, does honor not only to them but to the country of which she is herself a citizen. I wish it were possible or advisable to present examples of her artistic triumphs whether in the translation of sonnet, lyric, or free verse forms. I can only hope that the pleasure of making these discoveries will be promptly and very generally enjoyed by all whose love of poetry may be in need either of stimulation or of further satisfaction.

BERTHA SULLIVAN PAPAZIAN.

Correspondence

Our Super-Assets and Naval Parity

Editor of UNITY:

The ratification of the Naval Treaty should speedily follow its presentation to the Senate, as it marks a little progress, and failure to ratify would make matters vastly worse. But there should be no doubt in the public mind as to this Treaty meaning increase of taxation, no reduction from past outgo as the great masses of the people had fondly hoped. Senator Robinson tells us that if we build up to parity it will cost us $100,000,000 a year for six years. In addition, we shall of course pay annually the $375,000,000 of the regular naval budget. Rear Admiral Moffat, one of our London naval experts, says, "If we have the national pride we boast of, we will have naval parity with Great Britain in fact, as well as in name. We have the population and the resources to be first and ought to be content with nothing else. Only a few years ago our people had no thought of naval parity. They have recently demanded it, and there is every indication that we will have it by 1936. It is necessary in order to retain our self-respect." Chairman Britten, of the House Naval Appropriations Committee, urges immediate action to make sure that we build up to parity. General Bullard some time ago told the metal workers convention that they must push the cruiser bill, "for it means $135,000,000 to you."

Who created this new "demand" for parity? When we did not have it, we were perfectly safe and content. Is it not the navy men themselves, the shipbuilders and the propagandists of the Shearer type? What evidence is there that our "people" have changed their minds or forgotten that we have been a world power from the start and during a century when we had a small navy, never had a nation declare war against us?

We are under no moral or legal obligation to build up to parity. All we have a right to insist on is parity of security, not parity of tonnage.

What was absolutely ignored in London was our super-assets for security. Unlike Great Britain, within gunshot of the continent and unable to feed herself, we have a great ocean on each side, and can feed ourselves. No existing fleet outside Great Britain's could cross the Atlantic, face a barrage of mines and attack our shores. So long as the Canadian border remains unguarded, and we could walk into Canada if attacked, such attack is unthinkable. The bugaboos created by those trying to pull our purse-strings, which the sensational press is exploiting to the utmost, warn thoughtful taxpayers of that false reliance on force which led to the World War. It is a ghastly fact which we must not shrink from confessing that our delegates, in fear of a powerful minority in the Senate, were chiefly responsible for avoiding action that should have followed MacDonald's lead in the proposal to abolish battleships and to make the Kellogg Pact the vital factor in the parley. This parley represented the nations that own 90 per cent of the navies of the globe, and are all pledged to "seek only pacific means of settlement" of all international disputes.

In our own country, which lost fewer than 100,000 in battle in all our five foreign wars combined, a country which is the safest in the world, we are spending more than any other nation for armaments. These cogent facts should be blazoned, as, aside from needless expenditure to promote not real security, but pride and vain prestige, we cannot blink at the fact that of late years we are losing our former moral influence in the world. What is America's idea of true "self-respect"? Are we to be fooled by smug phrases? There is a new suspicion and disrespect for our nation which our materialism, imperialism and new reliance on force are fostering. Citizens who are indifferent to these indisputable facts and do not protest earnestly and promptly may find us further from world peace in 1936 than we are now. Energetic public protests are not vain. It was not long ago that the aroused conscience and common sense of the people smashed the 71 warship program.

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Boston, Massachusetts

Social and Economic Work in India

Editor of Unity:

I have the greatest pleasure to draw your attention to the existence of the Association for the Social and Economic Development of India which holds out a unique opportunity along social and economic lines. This is a venture in India for Indians by Indians, and you, in whose mind the well-being of India is the uppermost, can not, I am sure, afford to keep yourself aloof from it much longer.

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Gandhi Fund

Relief for the Sufferers of the Non-Resistant Struggle in India

Anonymous	$ 25.00
Anonymous	25.00
Anonymous	200.00
Mr. Andrew Allan	1.00
Miss Alice Stone Blackwell	10.00
Miss Jean Conklin	5.00
Mrs. F. H. Cross	25.00
Anna N. Davis	25.00
Miss Ruth M. Dodge	3.00
Miss Marguerite Emilio	5.00
Miss Annette Finnigan	100.00
Mr. James Gillespie	2.50
Dr. Sydney Strong	25.00
Miss Agnes Walberg	10.00
	$461.50

The Tragic Dilemma in India

It would be difficult to imagine a more tragic dilemma than that which India now presents to the MacDonald Government. The resistance to British authority led by Gandhi is of a kind with which the Western mind is peculiarly unfit to deal. Were Gandhi leading an insurrection, were he attempting to seize the power of government, there would be ample precedents as to how to meet him. But Gandhi, by renouncing the weapons of war, has made it infinitely difficult for the British to resort to those weapons. In so far as he has disarmed his own followers he has in very large degree morally disarmed the British. It is impossible to strike hard and with conviction at men who refuse either to parry the blow or to return it. While their discipline and courage hold out the followers of Gandhi cannot be successfully coerced. Unless they are provoked to violence the ordinary procedure of arrest and punishment would merely strengthen their resistance. Deliberately to provoke violence in a nation of three hundred millions in order to be able to suppress it is, on the other hand, as dangerous as it is revolting.

To tolerate the resistance is equally impossible. For the type of resistance employed by Gandhi is far more dangerous than ordinary insurrection: what he is doing is designed not only to bring government and business to a standstill but to disintegrate their foundations. A social order rests in the last analysis on the habit of accepting it; Gandhi is dissolving that habit. If he proceeds he will demoralize completely the Westerners' imperialism.

The peculiar force of the tragedy lies in the fact that the most civilized empire of the West should have failed after a decade of opportunity to come to an understanding with a leader of Gandhi's supreme generosity and fairness. It may be too late to reach such an understanding: the breach may be irreparable. The moral courage it would require to meet Gandhi on his own plane of action and to convince him now of the sincerity of any offer is perhaps more than can be expected of a harassed leader of a minority party in Great Britain. But the alternatives, though they call for less courage, would seem to be even more desperate.

NEW YORK *World.*

Institute of Politics

Tenth Session

July 31 to August 28, 1930

Preliminary Announcement of the Program

The Institute of Politics began its annual sessions in 1921. The small round-table or discussion-group method which it adopted as the principal means of accomplishing the education of adults in foreign affairs proved so effective that it has been included as an essential part of their programs by nearly all the learned societies.

This experiment in adult education has been a success, so much of a success that many other Institutes for the study of international and domestic politics have been established in various sections of the country.

In addition to the round-table conferences, the program of the Institute of Politics offers daily a "General Conference" in which the members of the various round-tables come together to hear a series of arguments for and against the project or policy which forms the subject of discussion for the day. At the conclusion of these formal arguments a general discussion follows.

The annual program of the Institute of Politics, in addition to these two widely different kinds of conferences, provides courses of lectures by distinguished visitors from foreign countries, and thus gives its members an opportunity to become familiar with their ideas about the foreign or domestic politics or the legal, political and economic institutions of the countries they represent.

The purpose of the Institute of Politics is to explore the facts underlying international events, to promote among adults the study of foreign affairs, to create international good will on the basis of an understanding of our respective problems and policies.

The annual sessions of the Institute of Politics have been made possible by the generosity of Williams College in lending the necessary plant, and by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, The General Education Board, The Carnegie Corporation, Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and Mr. Herbert H. Lehman for financial support.

Program

Having in mind the important factors in the current international situation, more than half of the effort of the Institute during its tenth session will be devoted to the study of a group of problems which may be described by the phrase "World Political Stabilization."

Lecture Courses

France and the Disarmament Problem—Dr. Paul Mantoux, Paris.

The Freedom of the Seas—The Rt. Hon. Lord Eustace Percy, London.

The Evolution of International Public Law in Europe Since Grotius—Dr. Walter Simons, Berlin.

Addresses

Western Civilization and the World —Professor C. DeLisle Burns, London.

India and Nationalism—The Rt. Hon. Lord Meston, K. C. S. I., London.

Conferences

Attendance at the meetings of the round table conferences is limited to duly enrolled members of the Institute. Each member will be assigned to one of the round-tables, the assignment depending on the member's ability and intention to contribute to the discussion going on in that conference. The round-tables meet at 9 a. m. on alternate days of the week.

Among the round-table conferences which the Institute has arranged are:

The Far Eastern Situation—Professor George H. Blakeslee, Clark University.

An Analysis of Western Civilization —Professor C. DeLisle Burns, University of London.

Recent Economic Progress in Europe —Professor Edwin F. Gay, Harvard University.

Limitation of Armaments—Admiral A. J. Hepburn, United States Navy.

Pan-American Problems—Professor Jesse S. Reeves, University of Michigan.

The Political Aspects of Aerial Navigation—Mr. Edward P. Warner, Editor, Aviation, New York.

Two or three groups of additional general conferences have been set up. The first of these groups will be under the leadership of Dr. Laura Martin of Washington, D. C., and will deal with the problems of sovereignty in the Arctic and Antarctic Regions. The other groups will consider the subjects of Intervention by the United States

---

The Association has its activity directed along the following helpful and practical channels:

1. To relieve economical stress and to develop and improve the economical conditions of its members.
2. To render facility for study in India and foreign countries of its members and their dependents on any reasonable terms.
3. To bring Medical and Legal advice and help within easy reach of its members at reduced rates.
4. To start Model Schools, Dispensaries and Nursing Homes outside Calcutta.
5. To endeavor to secure employment for the members of the Association, etc.

Anyone who is acquainted with the economic and social pressure of the country will acknowledge the necessity of the introduction of such an Association for Indians, in these days and appreciate the high ideal upheld by it.

I will be extremely glad to furnish you with fuller details of the Association if you feel interested to co-operate in the fulfilment of this great endeavor.

Calcutta, India SHANHI S. RAY

in the Caribbean Area, the Independence Movement in India, and the Communistic Experiment in Russia.

Geographer of the Institute

Professor Frank E. Williams, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania.

Eligibility Requirements

Membership in the Institute is open to men and women who are competent to contribute to the discussion going on in some one of the Round-Table Conferences.

Those desiring to apply for membership should write to the Institute of Politics, 1 Hopkins Hall, Williamstown, Mass. The Registration fee for members is $25.00 payable at time of registration. No other fees are charged.

An Appeal to all Christian Workers and Missionaries

Dear Friends:

We are at present passing through one of the greatest crises in India's long history—a crisis that bids fair to leave its mark not only on India but on humanity itself. The days when personal differences were fought out by duels is practically a thing of the past. Private individuals no longer appeal to brute force. But nations are still resorting to barbarous methods of violence; and might is right in International disputes. There has been a race for armaments in spite of repeated efforts at reducing them since the World War. There is no need for me to point out at this late hour that warfare reduces us to the level of brutes and mechanised warfare to one even below that. We need to exert ourselves to rise to, at least, a human level if not to a spiritual plane. Enlightened men the world over have been striving for what William James calls "a moral equivalent for warfare," as a means of settling national disputes. Before our very eyes Gandhiji is substituting for warfare the gospel of love in a practical way. The details may have to be worked out to a greater degree of refinement before Satyagraha can be used on an universal scale, but the basic principle is the one that concerns us vitally at this moment.

What is going to be the contribution of those of us who profess to follow the Prince of Peace whose banner is Love? At this juncture a great responsibility is laid on our shoulders which we dare not shirk. Here is an opportunity at our very door the like of which Christendom has never faced before. Do we not hear the Man of Sorrows say, "He that taketh not his cross and followeth after me is not worthy of me"? The choice is imminent.

I am perfectly aware that our political views may honestly differ and we may be poles apart. Amongst Christians, there are Indians and foreigners and those who see eye to eye with the national movement and those who may honestly believe that the Nationalists are misled. But there can be no difference of opinion regarding non-violence amongst those who were enjoined by their Master to turn to "whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek the other also" and to return good for evil.

No appeal is necessary to those who are in full agreement with Gandhiji and who are convinced that this movement is to clothe the naked and feed the hungry as these friends are committed to non-violence.

My appeal is mainly to those who differ from the national cause. They have a great function to perform. I know some of the foreign missionary friends are here under a contract with the British Government not to interfere in Politics. But where non-interference means compromising a principle which they hold fundamental, I submit that they are bound in loyalty to their Lord to impress upon the Government the duty of adopting non-violent methods, even at the risk of their very lives. I am quite conscious that theirs is a more difficult task than swimming with the current of the national movement but I am certain that the greater task affords a greater opportunity to "let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

In today's issue of Young India there are cited numerous cases of brutalities practised by the Police. I give here the following two reorts only:

From Delhi

"Ten volunteers were wounded as the Police tried to wrest from our hands a bucket of salt. Only after they had belaboured us to their hearts' content could they dispossess us of our salt. . . . Among the wounded five were seriously injured. They had been heavily belaboured on the chest and the abdomen. Two received severe injuries on their private parts."

From Dholera

"Eight to ten Policemen fell upon Ambalal. They brutally pressed his testicles, struck him with fists on the chest and abdomen, pressed their finger nails on his neck, so much so that Ambalal fell senseless. Mr. Fletcher and others quietly witnessed the brutality."

After these accounts no more words from me will be needed to commend to your Christian spirit the noble cause of non-violence. As far as the Satyagrahis themselves are concerned they pride in their tribulations and thank God for the opportunity of suffering much for what they hold to be a righteous and a sacred cause like the early Christian Martyrs. But that does not condone the violence on the Government side. I am confident that no true Christian, be he Indian or foreign, will leave a stone unturned in finding ways and means of persuading the Government to use humane methods in their attempt to "maintain Law and Order."

JOSEPH CORNELIUS KUMARAPPA.

Ahmedabad, India.

Walt Whitman Fellowship

The twenty-fifth annual birthday celebration will be held at eight o'clock, Saturday evening, May 31, 1930, in the Cameo Room of the Morrison Hotel, Chicago. Admission, fifty cents.

Among the speakers will be Dr. Preston Bradley, Llewellyn Jones, Professor Robert E. Park and Clarence Darrow, who will attend if in the city.

Dinner guests will assemble in the Cameo Room from 5:30 to 6:30 P. M., where dinner will be served—table d'hote at one dollar or a la carte.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

MAY
Is the month for the year's greatest cleaning. The home's cold weather drapes and rugs, blankets and comforters, heavy motor robes, should all be cleansed before putting them away. Summer cretonnes and slip covers should be made ready for service. Send work here in confidence of its being done by the latest equipment and methods.
Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue